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**Project Design and Financing**

**1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

25th of September 2018 (cseverin): At the time of PIF the project had 26 activities/outputs. at the time of CEO endorsement the project features 74 activities/outputs. Please consider if the major increase in activities will impact the project's ability to deliver.

Response to Secretariat comments

Many thanks for this practical observation from GEFSEC to consolidate the number of activities. We have now grouped the activities to reduce their number and this makes it easier to understand and to monitor. Attached is the revised results framework, which has also been now integrated into the new version of the Project Document (ProDoc). The number of activities has been significantly reduced from 74 to 48 (***please see page numbers 68 to 89 of the new version to see these changes***). We think this would be the optimal way of identifying the activities to ensure that we have a good handle on these tasks during implementation and for better monitoring and reporting.

**2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

20th of September 2018 (cseverin): Partly, it is noted that the proposal include 74 distinct activities, which seems like a lot to be delivering upon. Please consider if it makes sense to compile these into larger clusters of activities.

It seems that a simplified set of component activities, where the a majority of the activity outputs be part of the results framework, instead of specific activities under the outputs and components, may well be supporting a more clear implementation structure.

Component 2.3 is to be demonstrating environmental impacts of the a suite of technologies and tools. Please include stress indicators in the results framework and potentially in the component and output description. The Results Framework currently only have number of demonstration projects as output indicator. Please include quantifiable environmental stress reduction indicators instead.

Component 3 centers around the private public partnership, eg activity 3.1.1.2 is focused on the financial contributions, hence it would be interesting to include a target pertaining to amount of funding raised, instead of having number of activities funded as the output indicator. Please ocnsider if this can be added or somehow refelcted in this output indicator.

As the project activities primarily will be contributing to the process leading to increased capacity on biofouling management, most of the included output indicators can be categorized as process indicators, therefore it is even more important for the project to be providing clear tangible indicators, as mentioned above on environmental stress reduction or amount of $$ raised) when possible. Both of these mentioned examples will be useful for catalyzing progress in other components as to the overall process of delivering to the project's objective.

Response to Secretariat comments

We thank GEFSEC for this important comment and we have taken onboard this valuable input as follows and the ProDoc revised accordingly:

The number of activities have now been significantly reduced to 48. Kindly refer to the previous comment for more information.

**Component 2.3:** As explained in the ProDoc, the Lead Partnering Countries (LPCs) will be provided with four options for the demonstrations sites. LPCs will be able to choose one option based on their national priorities. As a result, it is expected that the demonstration sites would result in an increased uptake of these improved management practices (including technologies) in the ports and marine protected areas to reduce the transfer of invasive species. With this in mind, we have taken the GEFSEC suggestion to use a stress reduction indicator and identified one indicator based on the area (in hectares) under improved management in LPCs and linked to the chosen option for the demonstration sites. ***Please see the changes in results framework (Page 70 of the ProDoc clean version)***

**Component 3:** As suggested, the indicator and end-of-project target has been changed to quantify the amount of cash co-financing raised from the private sector to implement activities conductive to improved management practices of biofouling. ***Please see the changes in results framework (Page 70 of the ProDoc clean version)***

**3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

20th of September 2018 (cseverin): Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

**4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

20th of September 2018 (cseverin): Yes, the project identifies some risks that potentially could hinder the delivery of the process leading to the development of a haul fouling partnership. Climate change as such is not specifically mentioned.

Response to Secretariat comments

**5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

20th of September 2018 (cseverin): Partly, the associated co-financing seems adequate, however, a couple of comments to be addressed:

1) on pp 99 under financial planning and management, all cofinancing is mentioned to be parallel co-financing. Does this mean that none of the leveraged cofinancing will be managed by the PCU/executing agency??  It is normally understood that cash cofinancing will be available for the PCU to manage. Further, if all cofinancing is parallel, how will the PCU ensuring that the substantial co-financing will be delivering towards the project's objective. Please consider if inkind cofinancing is a more appropriate term compared to parallel.

2) Please ensure that all  cofinancing letters have been included in the submission. the co-financing letters from UNDP, the strategic partners and other countries cant be found.

3) please double check the total for the RCOs.

4) please explain how the cofinancing from the private sector have been calculated and particular if (and how) the value of the estimated in house initiatives have been included in the total of cofinancing

5) It seems that the RCO in kind cofinancing for CPPS and SACEP has a remarkably similarity even down to full alignment between cofinancing at the specific activity level.

Response to Secretariat comments

1) Thank you for this timely suggestion and offering an opportunity to define such financing correctly. As suggested, the text in page 95 has been modified to eliminate the term “parallel” and reflect clearly the different types of co-financing that will be contributed by all the stakeholders. In this regard, the total co-financing will be USD 41,451,287, of which USD 1,055,000 will be in cash and managed directly by the Project Coordination Unit (PCU). The remaining USD 40,396,287, will be categorized as “in-kind co-financing”. Since most part of this in kind co-financing is coming from the IMO member States and strategic partners, it is relatively easy for the PCU to track these and to ensure that these are linked to the objectives of the project. All co-financing will be tracked consistently during the implementation phase, with appropriate monitoring and reporting tools created to that effect.

2) Apologies for this technical error. There may have been an issue with the submission of the file. All letters of support and in-kind co-financing from LPCS and RCOs and cash co-financing from private sector were part of Annex K, which was sent separately due to the large size of the file. The revised submission includes this file again.

With reference to strategic partners, it should be noted that although only two of them confirmed the amount of around 5.5 million USD (based on their in house investments), there are almost 40 other letters of support. Most strategic partners were unable to quantify the value of their cooperation at this stage, although IMO has made its estimations and the Project will document this during implementation.

The scenario for ‘Other countries’ is similar. IMO has made estimations of the value of cash and in-kind co-financing, based on the discussions that have been held to date with State representatives. However, most donors confirmed that securing a letter with budgetary allocations would be a long process that could have delayed the submission of the ProDoc beyond the delivery deadline. In view of this, IMO has secured letters of endorsement that confirm the support from developed countries, but leaving the quantification of contributions to the implementation phase. This decision was reinforced by the fact that the amount of co-financing put forward for ‘Other Countries’ in the PIF was 0.9 M, which is amply offset by other confirmed contributions.

3) We did recalculate and confirmed that the total for RCOs is correct. Please refer to comment 5 further below.

4) Co-financing from the private sector is based on the pledges made by private sector companies in their letters of support given in Annex K. A limited number of private sector representatives have been approached during the preparation phase and this cash co-financing pledge is taken into the prodoc calculation. It is expected that the project may be able to mobilize much more than what is being pledged and the PCU will keep a track on this when expanding to include other industry members during the course of the project.

The value of the estimated in-house initiatives of the private sector has been calculated as USD 13 million per annum, as per the information provided in the letters of support from private sector partners received during the preparation phase. Based on this, the value of in-house initiatives within the private sector could be extrapolated to USD 65 million over the lifetime of the project. However, IMO has taken a precautionary approach and not taken this large projected figure into co-financing calculations at this stage, as such projections may need further assessments and evidence.

5) All RCOs where provided with a co-financing calculation template. The template only listed the project activities where RCOs would contribute, the only variable being the pro-rata salary of the staff member designated to help the project (RCOs do not have any hosting responsibilities, as this is taken care of by the LPCs) based on time contribution. For this reason, introducing the same salary in such a template will result in exactly the same figures (the same activities per year are applicable to each RCO). In this particular instance, we think it is only a coincidence that these two RCOs considered similar salary-scale (perhaps being two UNEP regional seas entities). Nevertheless, please note that this calculation is only an approximation and does not include initiatives undertaken by the RCO at the regional level to support GloFouling beyond what is marked in the list of outputs.

All co-financing will be monitored and documented by the PCU throughout the project implementation phase. It should be noted that IMO has clear guidelines related to M&E of in-kind co-financing and a monitoring tool in place created to this effect.

**6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

20th of September 2018 (cseverin):Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

**7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

NA

Response to Secretariat comments

**8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

20th of September 2018 (cseverin):Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

**9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

20th of September 2018 (cseverin):Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

**10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

20th of September 2018 (cseverin):Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

**Agency Responses**

**11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:**

GEFSEC

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

20th of September 2018 (cseverin):Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

20th of September 2018 (cseverin):Yes, the STAP comments have been addressed through commentary and edits in the prodoc.

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

25th of September 2018 (cseverin):Germany provided supporting comments, nothing to be addressed by project proponents.

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

25th of September 2018 (cseverin): NA

Response to Secretariat comments

**Recommendation**

**12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

25th of September 2018 (cseverin): No please address above comments and resubmit

Response to Secretariat comments

**Review Dates**